



SPECIAL  
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS  
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





A N  
ADDRESS  
TO THE  
Church of England  
CLERGY,  
CONCERNING  
Resistance.

---

---

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by *S. Popping*, at the *Raven*  
in *Pater-Noster-Row*, 1710.

Price Three Pence.

THE

OF

THE

CLERGY

OF

ENGLAND

AND  
OF THE  
BISHOPS  
OF THE  
DIocese

---

---

A N  
ADDRESS  
TO THE  
*Church of England*  
CLERGY.

---

*Gentlemen,*

**Y**OU know very well, what Methods  
K—— J—— took, first to set up  
Arbitrary Power, and then Popery.

After defeating the Duke of M——th, and  
several Thousands, that *did vigorously* (tho' nor  
*successfully*) *withstand* Popery in the beginning of  
his Reign ; he got an Army of Church of Eng-  
land Men, with about 8 or 10000 Irish Papists,  
in all above 30000.

A 2

With

With this Army (if he had been back'd and supported by it, (as he expected) he intended to reign Arbitrarily, and reestablish Popery in all his Dominions.

I need not enter far into the Methods he took to obtain this End: But in short, he annul'd almost all the Old Corporation-Charters, and gave New ones fitter for his purpose; put into the New-model'd Corporations such Tools, as he thought would elect Parliament Men to his liking; made such Clergy-Men Bishops, as, when Time should serve, would openly declare themselves to be Papists; gave Commissions to Judges, Justices of Peace, and Commanders in Fleet and Army, that were actually Papists: turn'd Protestants out of Colleges in *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, and put in Papists; and did a great many more illegal Things, which are too well known already, to be repeated.

These Things he did; because he thought he had an Army to maintain him in all his Proceedings.

As for the *Irish* Soldiers, he was sure of them; because they were Papists. And as for the Church of *England* ones, he thought that their Principle of Obeying every Royal Command, would make them as serviceable to him as the *Irish* Papists. But in this he was mistaken, as all the World knows. For when came to a Tryal, (as it did, when *Archbishop Sandcroft*, the *Bishop of London*, and abundance of other Great Men, invited the Prince O——e to come and rescue us from Popery and Slavery) vast Numbers of the Church



*England* Soldiers deserted, soon after the *Prince* landed. And even those, that did stay with the King till he *fled*, were not without good Grounds suspected by him of being Foes to his Designs: Because they were the of the same Principles with those that had forsaken him. I am now speaking of the *English*, who (most of 'em, if not all) shew'd, some before and some after the King lost his Crown, that they had no mind to inflave their Country; and therefore honourably lifted themselves under the Prince of *O—ge*, who came to save it.

There were several Thousands more under the Conduct of the Duke of *Devonshire*, and other Noblemen, (who all took up Arms to resist.) I need not be particular. But certainly taking up Arms to resist, must be Resistance in fact. And I dare say, *K— J—* would have punish'd most of these as Rebels, if he had kept Possession of the Crown and driven the *Prince* away.

It cannot be deny'd, but *K— J—* intended; that all his *English* Soldiers as well as his *Irish*, should fight for Popery and Arbitrary Power against him, who came to redeem us from both. But instead of doing so, every Body knows that several Thousands prevented him from laying such Commands upon 'em, by deserting him. And the rest, that were of the same Principle in Religion (*i. e.* Church of *England* Men) gave him sufficient Grounds to think, that, if he had commanded 'em to resist the Prince of *O—ge*, they would

not do it. And therefore he was forc'd to fly.

I will not pretend to accuse Church of *England* Men of resisting their Sovereigns before ; tho' perhaps it is not difficult to prove.

But this Instance is so plain, that it cannot without S——*elian Confidence* be denied.

K—— J—— was a True Heir of the Crown, lawfully succeeded his Brother, and was as lawfully crown'd King of *England*. And yet because he endeavour'd to restore Popery and set up Arbitrary Power, the Church of *England* Soldiers disobey'd him ; nay, not only refus'd to oppose the Prince of O——ge, but went over to him, in order to resist their Sovereign. But he prevented 'em of their Design, by a precipitate Flight ; as they had defeated him of his, by an honourable Desertion.

But that it may farther appear, how the Church of *England* Militant here upon Earth, can upon Occasion wave the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, and make use of *Resistance* ; a Doctrine indeed verbally condemn'd by some of Church of *England*, but in this Instance visibly practis'd by it) it's very well known, that they with the Prince of O——ge's Troops resisted K—— J——'s at *Reading* ; where some were kill'd on both sides.

If all these are not Acts of Resistance, I know not what is.

Perhaps,

Perhaps, *Gentlemen*, You'll say, That the *Church of England* did not do this: Because the *Clergy* did not do it. But pray, What does the *Church of England* consist of? Does it not consist of *Laity* as well as *Clergy*? Are you the only Persons that are properly the *Church of England*? At this rate, none are of the *Church of England*, but *Clergymen* of that Church. Laymen have no right to be call'd *Church of England Men*; and consequently the *Soldiers* that fought against King *James* were of *some other Church*. But I believe those very Champions of Liberty would be highly affronted, if you should deny them the Honour of being of *that Church*, as well as for it.

But not to mince the Matter any longer, you your selves resisted Popery, by Writing and Preaching; tho' he commanded the contrary.

The Protestant Fellows too of *Magdalene College in Oxford* resisted his Commissioners, (that went thither to put in the King's President, and turn out those that were Disobedient;) by shutting their Gates against them for two or three Days together. This they did, till the Commissioners ordered the Gates to be forc'd open.

You universally too resisted him in not reading his *Declaration* in favour of the Dissenters, publish'd in the latter End of his Reign, when he repented of his former *Severities* towards them.

All these Acts of Resistance were practis'd by the Church of *England*, before the Revolution; besides many others, which I need not mention now.

This is wonderful, that the *High church Clergy*, who us'd to preach up an *Unbounded Obedience*, could not practice it themselves. I know not how to account for it, unless they found their Doctrine had done 'em a Prejudice. There can be no other Reason given, why they acted so contrary to it.

By this, however, we may gather, that they did not *believe* it, tho' they *preach'd* it. From hence at least we may learn this useful Maxim, That some *Temporal Concerns* are of greater Weight than some *Spiritual*. And without doubt it was much better to make use of a little Resistance, which we found profitable to us, than to have kept to a *Doctrine*, which had like to have ruin'd us.

You see, *Gentlemen*, How unadvisedly in those Days you promoted a Doctrine, of which at last you were forc'd to repent.

As for the *Moderate Clergy* (the truest and best Pillars of the Church then, (as well as now) they had no Occasion to be angry with-themselves for what they did. They acted indeed contrary to some of the King's Commands. And yet their *Non Obedience* was conformable to the Gospel and our Laws. But many of your Books and Sermons were one while contrary to our Constitution and St. *Paul's* Meaning. And in a little time more, your  
Actions

Actions were contrary to your Books and Sermons. Were not you then who believ'd (if you did believe) *the Doctrine*, more blameable than they who did not? Certainly their *Non-compliance* to the King's Commands is and will be eternally glorious, because it was agreeable to the Gospel and our Laws; whereas your *Disobedience* will be look'd upon as a Case of Necessity, and consequently less Innocent and Honourable, because it was not answerable to your pretended Doctrine.

They never pretended to pay or preach more *Obedience*, than what was *lawfully* due to K——— Whereas you, in one part of his Reign, were continually harranguing it from the Pulpit, that an *Unlimited Obedience* was his Right. And then in another part of it, you contradicted by your *Practice*, what you had *preach'd* before.

But certainly you forgot your selves, when your *Practice* was opposite to your *Theory*; at least when you bestow'd that Honour upon a limited Being, which can only belong to an Unlimited one.

Now K——— J——— was *limited* in a double sense; first as he was a Man bounded by the superficies of his Body and the circumambient air, and then as a King bounded by the Laws. How then could an *Unbounded Obedience* be due to him? This was robbing God of that, which was due to him, and him only of all the Beings in the World.

After all, it's to be fear'd that this *Doctrine* (in spite of all your Oratory) will be an eternal



eternal Stain upon those, that have promoted it. For every Body must see for the future, that it is perfect *Flattery* at least, if not *Blasphemy*.

Consider with your selves how often this Nation has been endanger'd by it; and how you your selves were forc'd to be *Disobedient*, after you had press'd other People to an *Unlimited Obedience* in the late K—— J——'s Time.

'Tis true you were to be commended for your *Disobedience*; because it produc'd a *good Effect*: but not for your pretended Doctrine of *Absolute Passive Obedience*; because it had an *ill* one.

I own as soon as you were sensible of the Inconveniences it had produc'd, you honestly wrote *against Him*, for whom you had dishonourably wrote before. Don't mistake me. I don't accuse you of writing for *Popery* once; tho' some did, that had been of the Church of *England*. But you did one while in K—— J——'s Time *vigorously* write and preach for Arbitrary Power; which was the main thing that encourag'd him to take those fatal Courses that he did. And all, because he thought it was not the Principle of Church of *England* Men to *resist*, being taught the contrary.

Little did you think that K—— J—— intended to make use of that Power against your selves; which *without you* he never could have had. But you know he did at last turn your own Weapon upon you. And therefore you thought it high time to look about you in order to save your selves. Then you wrote  
*vigorously*

vigorously against Popery; and some of you against *Absolute Passive Obedience*.

But if you would have made an ampler Satisfaction to your Country for the Crime of Writing and Preaching in behalf of *Absolute Obedience*, which brought this Nation into the greatest Danger it ever was in (and I hope ever will be again) you ought all to have follow'd the brave Examples of the Bishop of London and the London-derry Clergy-man, Dr. Walker, and taken up Arms in Defence of the Church of England, as they did. And yet I question, whether even this, if you had done it, would fully have expiated the Fault of preaching an *Enslaving Doctrine*, a thing unpardonable in our *Free Country*.

Now you that are for this Arbitrary Doctrine, I would ask you, if all Kings (be they never so bad) ought to have a *Passive Obedience* paid to 'em, and *are not to be resisted upon any Pretence whatsoever*; what pretence had you to withstand your King either in his Authority or Religion? What Scripture had you to produce, in opposition to that Rule of St. Paul's, *Be subject to the Higher Powers*; unless it be this, *that Magistrates are the Ministers of God for Good*? And if you knew of this, when you us'd to preach up Obedience, why did not you tell your Flocks in the beginning of K.—J—'s Reign as well as at the latter End of it, that *Obedience* was only due to such *Magistrates*?

While

While K—— J—— in the beginning of his Reign, put the *Penal Laws* in execution against Dissenters, you thought you had a good King. And for this Favour which he did you in prosecuting those, whom you look upon as as your Enemies, (because they dislike a few Church-Ceremonies, which you are fond of) you bestow'd a great Compliment upon him: much greater, I am sure, than such *severe Prosecutions* could deserve. For you made him *Absolute* by your Preaching, who was only a *limited King* by Law. Then *Absolute Passive Obedience* was thunder'd from almost every Pulpit in *England*.

But when the same King, whom you had flatter'd before with an *Absolute Power*, came to invade the Rights and Properties of the Church of *England*, then you cry'd out, *All was lost*. Then you wrote against *Popery*, and manfully withstood *Arbitrary Power*. Nay, in effect, you animated People to resist, by saying, *The Church is in Danger*; just as you now set People a raving against the Dissenters, by reason of their Toleration; fondly and ridiculously thinking *the Church to be in Danger* from That, as it was before from *Popery*.

I shall now go back to Resistance; to make it more plain, that the Church of *England* did resist K—— J——.

I have prov'd already that he was resisted by your Selves, and Laymen of the same Religion with your Selves, before the Revolution. But I am going to prove farther, that



that the Church of *England* resisted him several Times since with their Fleets and Armies.

When he went into *Ireland*, in order to regain that and afterwards *England* and *Scotland*, all which he had Abdicated ; the Church of *England* Soldiers resisted him there too. Nor ought I here to forget the Reverend Dr. *Walker*'s great Piety and Courage, who gloriously defended *London-derry* for some Months against a powerful Popish Army. Nay, the Church of *England* Soldiers, after this, defeated K—— J——'s whole Army at the *Boyne*, and forc'd him into *France*, from whence he came.

Besides, if his Ally the King of *France* did at any time but send a Fleet or Army out to reduce the *English* to the Obedience of their Sovereign ; the Church of *England* Parliaments always most unnaturally fitted out Ships to oppose and destroy his. And the Church of *England* Clergy too as unnaturally pray'd for the Success of King *William*'s Fleets and Armies, in opposition to those Fleets and Armies that only endeavour'd to restore to the *English* their Abdicated King.

And thus have Church of *England* Folks, we Clergy as well as Laity, resisted K—— J—— all his Life-time since the Revolution, and still continue to resist (and I hope we ever shall) his pretended Son ; not only with Car-  
nal

nal Weapons but Spiritual too, as you know we did K—— J——.

Now, *Gentlemen*, was K—— J—— a Lawful King or no? And if he was a Lawful one, Why did you resist him? Does not *St. Paul* say, *He that resists shall receive to himself Damnation*. Why would you then be so imprudent, as to endanger Souls, in *withstanding your King's Religion and Arbitrary Power*? Did you *withstand* him, or did you not? Do you *withstand* the Pretender, or do you not? If you did withstand him, and do withstand his pretended Son; never deny it, but confess, that you resisted with Learned Arguments and Disloyal Actions: Some of you by taking up Arms, more of you by Writing, and all in general by Praying heartily against both.

Having made it plain, that the Church of *England* Clergy, as well as Laity, resisted K—— J——; I now come to examine the Reasons, why *Dr. Sacheverell* and his Party came to deny the actual Resistance made before the Revolution.

*King William* did us that kindness to free us from Popery. And I hope there is no danger of it's return. Besides, we have a Protestant Majesty, upon the Throne. And most of our Clergy's Eyes at present centre there. They know She can oblige 'em with good Preferments. And to get these, What will not  
some

some Sycophants do? High-church Men have been the cunningest in all Reigns. And their Non-resistance was a beneficial Topick. But I hope we have at present one, and shall have such, as will not take the least notice of their High Strains.

I am not so uncharitable, as to think they design *Mischief* by their unlimited Doctrine. No. They are better Men, than to *meditate Harm* to their Country by it: This was evident, by what our Clergy did formerly. For they themselves resisted a King, who took too much *Advantage* of their Doctrine. This was *fact*: And they have confess'd it. See the *Middlesex* Clergy's Address. And therefore, whatever they say now concerning an *unlimited Obedience* due to Sovereigns; it's my Opinion, they *will* practice against it, as they *did* then, when ever they find the Church to be in danger from *Him* that *Governs*.

*Church - Preferments*, under colour of the *Church*, are their chief Care. And therefore no Body ought to blame 'em for flattering those, who they think will carefully espouse their *Interest*.

'Tis true *High-church Men* in K—= J—'s time ran very great hazards in *flattering* him. Because he was artfully contriving how to undermine the *Church*, while they endeavour'd only to get the *best Preferments* in it.

Very

Very few of 'em I believe (if any) had really an Intention to subvert the Government in those Days; by preaching this Doctrine. Yet they that preach'd it, had as great a hand in the Ill Degns that were then carry'd on as any of his Privy-Councillors; tho' they were such ill Politicians, as not to know it.

Now if every Soul then had *believ'd*, what they had *heard*; or if our Clergy themselves had *believ'd* the Doctrine they had *preach'd*; where should we have had any Body to *withstand* Popery and Arbitrary Power? No Body, except the Dissenters, certainly had done it. And therefore I think *High-church Men* did not at that time so much consult the Good of their *Country* as their *own*, when they propagated this Doctrine: whatever they may do in this or future Reigns.

Some of you indeed pleas'd K—— J—— by it, and by pleasing him in that respect got good Preferments in his time. But how long his favour was to last you could not tell: Because he affected Popery, and had an Intention to plant it here.

But now we have a Protestant Monarch, and are like to have Protestant Successors. And therefore, tho' the Non-resistance Doctrine was injurious to our Country then, it mayn't be so now. The Scene is alter'd. And the Doctrine may prove, as it did then to some of us, *beneficial*.



*neficial* to us again. Yet this is more than we certainly know. How? Not profitable to us, when a Protestant Monarch is upon the Throne? To this I Answer, That Monarchs succeeding K—— J—— must needs know how he was deceiv'd, and consequently will not perhaps be so inclinable to listen to the *Flattering Doctrine*, as he was.

You'll say perhaps all Monarchs will not be alike: And Flattery in some Reigns may be useful still. But then you don't consider Consequences. You may make such an Impression upon People's Minds for the future by continually preaching *the Doctrine*, that they may really believe it. And if after this, we should be so unfortunate as to fall into the Hands of a Popish King again, what must we do? I say, future Reigns may (for ought any Body knows) not prove like this. And if they should not, Who will dare to resist, if you say they must not?

Come, *Gentleman*, Let me tell you, Arbitrary Power is as bad in any Reign, as Popery. And it is a doubtful Case between the Sovereign and the People, who it is most dangerous to. In short, your *Doctrine* that favours it, seems to be such a Poison as may produce ill Effects to one as well as t'other. And therefore it had better be entirely laid aside. But this is a Thing fit to be debated by a Parliament. And I hope the next will take it into Consideration.

All kind of Flattery is odious. But this sort of it, is not only odious, but dangerous too. Was it not dangerous to bestow it, where you did once? You know in K—— J——'s time, tho' you got some Preferments by it at first, yet at last you had like to have lost all. Others too as well as your selves had like to have been Sufferers by this Doctrine, if they had not *disbeliev'd* it. Happy was it for us, that our Clergy did *not believe* it themselves. For if they had, Who would have ventur'd to resist Popery and Arbitrary Power?

Every Thing then lay at stake. And therefore our Clergy as well as Laity, were forced to withstand those *two Enemies* to our Constitution. If they had not; the one could not have continued in their Livings, nor the other kept their Estates, without turning Papists.

Now because K—— J—— fled out of the Kingdom, and but few between the Two Armies were kill'd, the *High-church Men* say, there was no Resistance (tho' there was) before the Revolution. And this they confidently affirm, only to make room once more for the Doctrine of Nonresistance, *profitable* indeed for some of our Clergy, but I know no other Service it can do.

Observe

Observe, *Gentlemen*, When your own Properties and Rights lay at stake, you could and did courageously resist your King, to save your Benefices. And are not you then guilty of that Popish Doctrine of Resistance, as well as that Popish Doctrine of Non-resistance?

The Non-resistance Doctrine was preach'd by Popish Priests in *France*; and by it they ruin'd the Liberty of their Country. The same Popish Doctrine was preach'd by Protestant Priests in *England*, and had like utterly to have ruin'd *English* Liberty.

Nay, if it had not been for the Practice of Resistance, (a Doctrine henceforth to be call'd Protestant not Popish, because the Church of *England* has practis'd it) we must have been all Papists by this time.

Now which is the best Doctrine? That which had like to have involv'd us in Popery? Or that, which sav'd us from it?

For shame, *Gentlemen*, Let not Resistance be call'd any longer a Popish Doctrine; since it is our Protestant Practice.

Do not pretend to annul Matter of Fact, by denying that Resistance was practis'd by your Selves, and the rest of the Church of

*land*; least the World should think that some of you are guilty of Hypocrisie.

Do not add this Sin, to the Sin of Resistance; of which most of you were guilty, and will be so again, whenever *Popery and Arbitrary Power meditate a Return*.

Is it not much better for you, to prove it to be no Sin?

If you would do this, as you may, and with less Difficulty too than the other Doctrine; then you would lie under no Scandal for resisting your Sovereign.

But if you call Resistance Popish, and practise it, how are you inclin'd? And if you practise Resistance, and say you don't when you do, don't you bring a Dishonour upon Religion by your Dissimulation?

You have deluded too many ignorant People, by saying, There was no Resistance before the Revolution. But with what colour could you do this? If you *wrote and preach'd against your King's Arbitrary Power*, as you say you did, after you had shamefully preach'd it up before; was it not a manifest Act of Resistance against your King? Were you not guilty of another Act of Resistance, when you refus'd to read his *Declaration*? Did you not resist



resist his Authority, in writing against Popery, when he ordered you not ?

You all have resisted him in some Sense or other. Nay, many of the Nonjuring Ministers too disobey'd him in several of his Commands, before the Revolution. And they had better have disobey'd him still, as you have done.

Even that renowned Bulwark of the Church of *England*, the Protestant Army, (which K—  
J—— impolitickly rais'd for it's Destruction) to their great Praise, resisted him, whom you in a manner had made Arbitrary. Was it not resisting him in good earnest, when they forc'd him to fly out of his Kingdoms ? Is not this sufficient, but you must needs require Thousands of 'em to be *slain*, before you will allow there was Resistance ? Those that resisted him, I dare say, will not thank you for desiring great Numbers of 'em should be *kill'd*, before they could properly be said to *Resist*. And yet a few of those that did *resist*, actually were *kill'd*.

I know you instruct People to say the King *Abdicated*. 'Tis true, he did *Abdicate*. But before he *Abdicated* in your Sense, he was resisted not only by the Church of *England* Soldiers, but by the Church of *England* Clergy too.

You insinuate that *Abdication* signifies quitting the Kingdom. But he *Abdicated*, before he went out of the Kingdom, as the Law recognizing the People's Rights made in the first Year of King *William's* Reign explains it; by relinquishing the true Legal way of Governing according to our Constitution.

This is the true Sense of *Abdication*, and Meaning of the Law. It is not *Deserting* or *Quitting* only, as you falsely have insinuated.

But what made him quit or desert, if you will have it to be *Desertion*? Was there no Compulsion in the Case? Did he quit voluntarily or involuntarily? If involuntarily, certainly he would never have *meditated*, as he often did, *a return to his Dominions*. But he did it involuntarily. And if involuntarily, then it was an undoubted sign, that he was *vigorously resisted*.

Pray, *Gentlemen*, Why is Absolute Passive Obedience preach'd now? Have we not often enough already been lull'd into Slavery by it? Were we not actually intrap'd in K—'s time by this Doctrine? And would you have it so again? We are mightily beholden to you for it.

You

You would not certainly desire to see your Fellow Subjects under Slavery, unless you expected to have some Share, with others, of that delicious Thing call'd Arbitrary Power.

I'm afraid you covet a certain *Empire* over People's Consciences. And this perhaps is one reason, why you preach Absolute Obedience. I find you do it, to prepare People of weak Consciences for the *wholsom Severities* you intend to inflict.

Farewell then to weak Consciences. We must all henceforward pay an *unlimited* Obedience to our *Absolute* Clergy.

And since I have ask'd you the Reasons of your preaching Absolute Obedience; I pray give me leave to ask, Why you condemn Resistance? Was it not the Church of *England's* Friend, to save it from Popery? Did not all of us practice it against K—— J——? And don't we say *we will withstand Popery and Arbitrary Power, whenever they mediate a Return?*

You know you have a good Protestant Queen, and are like to have as good Protestant Successors; if you don't let People too much into the Secret, that Resistance is damnable, and so make 'em repent of what they did formerly.

But if you say they are to be damn'd for Resistance ; How do you know but they may, to redeem their Souls from Slavery, venture once more to put their Persons into Bondage, by inviting hither the P——r ? This they may do. Or, if he is not next in Blood, they may do as ill, by inviting a Popish P——e that is nearer than the H——ian Family, to make amends for their former Transgressions in resisting K—— J——, and settling the *Hanover* Succession.

Perhaps some of you think the Doctrine of Absolute Passive Obedience is necessary to keep the *Dissenters* in awe. But they, I presume, never *did* believe it. And why should you think they *will* ? It cannot be thought, that they will be persuaded into a Belief of that, which very few of you (if any) believe really your selves. I'm sure you did not, when you universally *disobeyed* some Commands a certain King laid upon you.

Besides all this, 'tis an *Impolitick* Doctrine. For no Church nor State can be safe, where it is preach'd. This may look like a Paradox. But the Truth of it will appear by making a Supposition that some of our Fellow-Subjects do not believe it : as without doubt the major Part of *Great Britain* does not. Those that don't, will continually be uneasie at it's being preach'd : especially if Tyranny and Oppressi-

on

on should in future Times be the Effects of it. These have been the Consequences of it, and the same may happen one time or other again.

Indeed, if it could universally be *believed*, no Rebellions could ensue the greatest Tyranny in the world. For People being once *generally persuaded* that they must not for Conscience-sake resist Arbitrary Power, they would not do it. But this is impossible in any Nation whatsoever. For there are Men in all Nations of different Opinions. And our Fellow Subjects particularly are famous for disagreeing with one another in Sentiments.

Now if any future Monarch should take the opportunity of turning a limited Kingdom into an Absolute one, because he is persuaded a great many of his Subjects believe *the Flattering Doctrine*; would not the rest, that don't believe it, be apt to resist the encroachments of an Illegal Power? Certainly some would. And if they should, is not Rebellion the Consequence of this Doctrine? Nay, Are not Rapine, Murder, and the like, the Effects of it? For no Rebellions ever were without these.

It will farther appear, that this Doctrine is directly opposite to the Interest of our State; by making another Supposition, that *all Church*



*Church of England Men* sincerely believe it. In this Case, a King may make himself Absolute; nay, establish Popery, or any other Religion he thinks fit; and *Church of England Men* must not resist him. If they should, they don't stand to their Principle. What must we do in this Case? Must we let the *Dissenters*, who don't believe the Doctrine, take up the Cudgels against Arbitrary Power, and a Religion which we don't approve of? Or must we obey the King in all his Commands?

The Cases above mentioned are not impossible: For nothing is impossible with God.

But to clear this Matter a little better, I'll repeat one Accident of this kind, that did really happen.

We had a King once, as all the World knows, who had a mind to set up Popery and Absolute Power in our Country, where a contrary Government and Religion were (and I hope ever will be) establish'd by Law. This I say befel us once. Let me now suppose all *Church of England Men* in general firmly believing the Doctrine of Absolute Obedience at the same time, that he was endeavouring to subvert the Legal Government of both Church and State: What must we have done? Must we have stood still, and not oppos'd his Illegal Proceedings? If our  
Clergy

Clergy should say we ought not, we had been ruin'd long ago either by him or the Dissenters. For he might have taken Advantage of our Principle, and notwithstanding our Numbers compass'd his Designs. Or else the Dissenters might have taken up Arms against Popery and Arbitrary Power, if the Church had not. And if they had, and had succeeded; where would the Church of England have been then? Would not Presbyterians, Independents and Anabaptists have got the Livings that we enjoy?

The Times of Forty One would certainly have return'd upon us, unless the Church of England had fought with and beaten the Dissenters. And if they had, could that have hinder'd our own Ruin? No. Beating the Dissenters would only have made the Church of England an easier Prey to K—— J——. For his Design was to establish Popery and Arbitrary. Now if Church-Men had effectually been poysoned with the Doctrine, the the Dissenters being quell'd, what could have prevented him of his Designs?

Prayers and Tears might in this Case have succeeded with GOD Almighty to do something for us: As indeed he did, by permitting us to resist. But what if he had not? Certainly K—— J——'s Design of altering our Constitution and Religion

ligion would have prevail'd beyond all that the Church of *England* could do with *Prayers and Tears*.

I hope it was not our Duty to have fought for K— J— against those, that deserted him for the Sake of Religion: nor to have contended for *Things*, which our Clergy in their last Address to her Majesty say they *vigorously withstood*.

And if they *vigorously withstood* Arbitrary Power then, why do they preach *Absolute Obedience* now? This is Contradiction upon Contradiction. Now they write for it, then they resisted it. Sometimes they speak against it, and other times they act for it. Is not this wonderful in such Men, as ought to shew greater Examples of Sincerity than others?

After all, Resistance is necessary sometimes; as you may remember very well it was in those Days, when your Arbitrary Doctrine had like to have enslav'd the Nation.

But pray, Gentlemen, don't exclaim against that, which was so necessary. You don't know what occasion you may have again for it in future Reigns.

I know you don't like Resistance, but only upon some certain Occasions. Who indeed does?



does? I dare swear even for those, whom you fancy to like Resistance better than you, that they as much dislike it as you can for your Lives, till the *Return of Popery or Arbitrary Power*. And I think I speak the Sense of the whole Body of *Dissenters*.

High-Church Men were the last that practis'd *Disobedience*; when they disputed with her Majesty her undoubted Right of Proroguing Convocations. Not to repeat all former Acts of their *Non-Obedience* mentioned before. But the *Dissenters* han't resisted for many Years: being satisfy'd with the Act of Toleration. And you don't know but they have forgot the Practice of it.

This at least you may depend upon, that no sort of People will resist, but those that are *oppress'd*. And if you will allow every Body to be free as well as your selves, neither the Church nor the State will be in danger by intestine Broils: but on the contrary *Both* securer much, than it would be, if *Severities* should be inflicted on some of your Fellow Subjects.

Now

Now let me desire you, for your own and Religion's sake, to shake Hands with the *Dissenters* : Joyning heartily with them in this Confession, that you have resisted, but that you never will resist again, till *Popery or Arbitrary Power meditate a Return.*

High-Church Men were the first who  
 gave offence; when they dis-  
 sented, they had undoubted right of  
 dissenting. Not to report of  
 dissenting, but to report of dissenting  
 dissenting, and the Dissenters  
 dissenting, being dissenting  
 dissenting, and dissenting  
 dissenting, and dissenting  
 dissenting, and dissenting

**FINIS.**







